Case 2:07-cv-02175-JPM-dkv Document 411 Filed 12/05/08 Page 1 of 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE WESTERN DIVISION

SPINE SOLUTIONS, INC., a) Delaware corporation,)	
Plaintiff,	Case No. 07-cv-02175-JPM-dkv
V. MEDTRONIC SOFAMOR DANEK, INC., an Indiana corporation; MEDTRONIC SOFAMOR DANEK USA, INC., a Tennessee corporation, Defendants.	FILED IN OPEN COURT AIS 08 DATE: 4:25pm INITIALS: JPW

JURY VERDICT FORM

We, the jury in the above entitled action, find the following special verdict on the following questions submitted to us:

Question No. 1

As to each of the following claims in the '071 Patent, has Medtronic proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that the claim you are considering is invalid due to obviousness?

A "Yes" answer below is in favor of the Medtronic defendants.

A "No" answer below is in favor of Spine Solutions.

Claim 1	Yes	Мо
Claim 2	Yes	No
Claim 6	Yes	No
Claim 7	Yes	No
Claim 11	Yes	No
Claim 13	Yes	No

Case 2:07-cv-02175-JPM-dkv Document 411 Filed 12/05/08 Page 2 of 4 If you answered "Yes" for all of the claims of the '071 patent above, then skip the remaining questions, sign the Special Verdict Form, and inform the Court Security Officer that you have finished deliberating. If you answered "No" for any of the claims of the '071 patent above, then proceed to Question No. 2.

Question No. 2

(a) Has Spine Solutions proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to damages in the form of lost profits?

If you answered "Yes" for Question No. 2, then proceed to Question No. 3. If you answered "No" to Question No. 2, then skip Question No. 3 and answer Question No. 4.

Question No. 3

Applying the preponderance of the evidence standard, what is the amount of lost profit damages to which Spine Solutions is entitled?

Question No. 4

Excluding the Medtronic infringing sales for which you awarded lost profits, what amount, if any, of Medtronic infringing sales has Spine Solutions proven by a preponderance of the evidence? (If you did not award any lost profits, you must include all of Medtronic's infringing sales.) Remember you may consider transactions only for the period August 30, 2005 to December 31, 2007.

Question No. 5

Applying the preponderance of the evidence standard, what is the percentage of reasonable royalty damages to which Spine Solutions is entitled?

% 18% reasonable royalty rate

Based on your answers to Questions 4 and 5, the Court will determine the total royalties owed, if any, by the following formula:

		\$	reasonable	royalty	base
(multiply by)	x	ક	reasonable	royalty	rate
(equals)	=	\$	total		

Keep in mind that you may <u>not</u> award duplicate damages (that is, if you have already awarded lost profits, <u>no</u> royalties are due on sales as to which you have awarded lost profits).

Question No. 6

Has Spine Solutions proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that Medtronic's infringement of the '071 patent has been willful?

Yes	ν	No

Presiding Juror: Parbara July	Date: 12.5-08
-------------------------------	---------------

After the presiding juror signs, then each juror should also sign, indicating agreement to each verdict (i.e., each answer) in the verdict form.

Barbara & Sucher	Jamela Louis
1	
Kell Her	Catharine Emse
Smather Indhon	78-
11 1	
Many Jaylo	M. Abdallat
Willie yonny	
V	
addie Willis	

1:\JURY INSTRUCTIONS.CIVIL\Patent\07-2175 Spine Medtronic\07-2175-Spine.jury verdict form.doc